

REMARKS

Following entry of the amendment, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 16-22 and 26-30 will be pending in this application, with the remaining claims having been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 16-19, and 21 will have been amended. As set forth in greater detail below, an agreement was reached between the undersigned and the Examiner to allow independent claims 1 and 21, and a tentative agreement was reached with respect to independent claim 16.

On February 2, 2005, a telephone interview was held in this case between the undersigned, the Examiner, and the Examiner's supervisor. Applicants thank the Examiners for granting the interview and for their reconsideration of the issues in this case. The following is a full summary of the interview. Claims 1, 7, 2, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26-30 were discussed. The Pence and Lerman references were discussed. Applicants raised the argument that timestamping a request on a queue is not the same as timestamping a queue. Following discussion, the Examiner and his supervisor agreed to allow a claim that recited the combined features of claims 1, 2, and 7, and a claim that recited the combined features of claims 21, 23, and 24. Additionally, the Examiner indicated that claim 16 would be allowed if it could be amended to recite substantially those features recited in claim 7, plus the feature that the requests on each of a plurality of queues encompassed in the claim (as opposed to the requests merely on a particular queue) were organized into the two sequences recited in claim 16.

Applicants have added the features of claims 2 and 7 to claim 1, and have cancelled claims 2 and 7. Applicants thus submit that independent claim 1 is now in condition for allowance in accordance with the agreement reached.

Applicants have added the features of claims 23 and 24 to claim 21, and have cancelled claims 23 and 24. Applicants thus submit that independent claim 21 is now in condition for allowance in accordance with the agreement reached.

Applicants have amended claim 16 in the manner described above. Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 16 comply with the tentative agreement reached with respect to that claim, and thus claim 16, as amended, should be allowed.

Additionally, claims 3-6, 8-10, 17-20, 22 and 26-30 are each dependent on one of the claims discussed above. While the undersigned did not specifically confirm during the

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0232/160298.01
Application No.: 09/783,820
Office Action Dated: January 7, 2005

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**


interview that these dependent claims were included within the agreement, these claims should be allowable at least by reason of their dependency on one or more of the allowable claims. Thus, applicants request that the dependent claims remaining after amendment be allowed as well.

Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing summary of the interview complies with the requirement to summarize the interview under 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b).

Finally, applicants have amended dependent claim 4 to address a typographical oversight. The amendment to claim 4 is not made for any reason related to patentability, and does not affect the scope of claim 4.

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the amendment places this case in condition for allowance. Thus, applicants request that the Examiner enter the within after-final amendments, withdraw the final rejection, and issue a Notice of Allowance for the claims that remain after amendment.

Date: February 16, 2005



Peter M. Ullman
Registration No. 43,963

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439